

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-40136

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 6, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

CYNTHIA ARADILLAS,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

LAREDO COLLEGE,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 5:21-CV-160

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before STEWART, HAYNES, and HIGGINSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:

This court must examine the basis of its jurisdiction, on its own motion if necessary. *Hill v. City of Seven Points*, 230 F.3d 167, 169 (5th Cir. 2000). In this civil rights case, on March 5, 2025, the district court entered an order denying Plaintiff's motions to amend the complaint and motions for summary judgement. Plaintiff has filed a *pro se* notice of appeal from that order.

No. 25-40136

“Federal appellate courts have jurisdiction over appeals only from (1) a final decision under 28 U.S.C. § 1291; (2) a decision that is deemed final due to jurisprudential exception or that has been properly certified as final pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 54(b); and (3) interlocutory orders that fall into specific classes, 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a), or that have been properly certified for appeal by the district court, 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).” *Askanase v. Livingwell, Inc.*, 981 F.2d 807, 809-10 (5th Cir. 1993). The district court’s order denying leave to amend the complaint is not a final or otherwise appealable order. *See Wallace v. County of Comal*, 400 F.3d 284, 291 (5th Cir. 2005). Likewise, the district court’s order denying the motions for summary judgment is not a final order. *See Francis ex rel. Francis v. Forest Oil Corp.*, 798 F.2d 147, 149 (5th Cir. 1986).

Accordingly, the appeal is DISMISSED for want of jurisdiction.